



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,849	02/10/2000	Robert L. Hudkins	CEPH-0939	3140

7590 12/19/2002

Michael P Straher
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz Mackiewicz and Norris LLP
46th Floor
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

WRIGHT, SONYA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1626

DATE MAILED: 12/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/500,849	HUDKINS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sonya Wright	1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-95 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 59,62,66-72 and 75-94 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 73 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1-58, 60, 61, 63-65, 73, 74 and 95 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a response to Applicant's amendment filed 9-20-02.

Claims 1, 41, 64, and 73 have been amended. Claim 42 has been canceled.

Claim 95 has been added.

The obviousness-type double patenting rejection and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been withdrawn.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph has been maintained for claim 73. The rejections of claims 1, 64 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph have been overcome with Applicant's amendment and the rejection of claim 2 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered (In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CaAFC, 1988)):

- 1) Nature of invention.

- 2) State of prior art.
- 3) Level of ordinary skill in the art.
- 4) Level of predictability in the art.
- 5) Amount of direction and guidance provided by the inventor.
- 6) Existence of working examples.
- 7) Breadth of claims.
- 8) Quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

Claim 73 is directed to "treating and the prevention of prostate disorders". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. There are a vast number of prostate related disorders Applicant does not give support for "preventing" all forms of these disorders. The art pertaining to prostate disorders remains highly unpredictable. The various forms of these disorders have different causative agents, involve different cellular mechanisms, and, consequently, differ in treatment protocol. Applicant gives limited examples which do not enable the full scope of this claim. Therefore, based on the unpredictable nature of the invention and state of the prior art and the extreme breadth of the claims, one skilled in the art could not use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

It is suggested that applicants delete "prevention" from claim 73 in order to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble of claim 73 is directed to "treating prostate disorders". The rest of the claim is directed to "such treatment or prevention". The preamble does not disclose "such prevention", therefore it is suggested that Applicant delete "prevention from the claim.

Claims 1-58, 60, 61, 63-65, 73, 74, and 95 are objected to for containing non-elected subject matter. In order to overcome this objection, it is suggested that Applicant limit the claims to the generic concept set forth by the Examiner in Paper Number 8 mailed May 6, 2002, including the modification that ring "J" is a three to seven membered ring containing oxygen as the only heteroatom, and the "J" ring may have substituents in accordance with the claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9-20-02 have been fully considered and have been found persuasive regarding the double patenting rejections, the 103 rejections, and the rejection of claims 2 and 64 under 112, but they are not persuasive regarding the rejection of claim 73 under 112. Applicant argues that claim 73 has been amended to remove the reference to "preventing" prostate disorders in claim 73. However, the preamble of claim 73 is directed to "treating prostate disorders". The rest of the claim is

directed to "such treatment or prevention". The preamble does not disclose "such . . . prevention", therefore it is suggested that Applicant delete "prevention" from the claim.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sonya Wright, whose telephone number is (703) 308-4539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (703) 308-4537. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7922. The Official fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [joseph.mckane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Joseph K. McKane

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 1600

Sonya Wright

December 17, 2002

Alan L. Rotman
ALAN L. ROTMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600